



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/585,524	07/07/2006	Per Munk Nielsen	10578.204-US	7930
25908 7590 07/02/2010 NOVOZYMES NORTH AMERICA, INC. 500 FIFTH AVENUE SUITE 1600 NEW YORK, NY 10110				
EXAMINER WILLIAMS, LEZA				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1787				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/02/2010		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

Patents-US-NY@novozymes.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/585,524

Applicant(s)

NIELSEN, PER MUNK

Examiner

LELA S. WILLIAMS

Art Unit

1787

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 April 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14, 17 and 18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14, 17 and 18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SI.08)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Interval Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's amendment filed on April 6, 2010 has been fully considered. The amendment necessitated the new ground of rejection set forth below and therefore, the following action is made final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 11, 14, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Winterbottom et al. CH Patent No. 356,659.

Winterbottom et al. discloses a method for producing a food product which comprises contacting meat with 3 to 30% lactobionic acid (pg. 2, lines 15-20 & pg. 3, line 24, pg. 4, line 16). Slaughtered poultry is submerged into the lactobionic acid containing solution, for a time of 30 minutes to 4 hrs (marinate), and allowed to freeze; the poultry is then packed and distributed to the market place (pg.1, lines 26-31 & pg. 5, lines 18-22). Winterbottom also discloses the poultry will be cooked (pg. 5, line 9), therefore becoming heated. Although Winterbottom does disclose that the flesh of the poultry "absorbs sufficient antibiotic matter to guarantee adequate protection" (pg. 6, line 24-26), the reference does not expressly disclose the amount of lactobionic acid absorbed. However, given that the poultry is soaked for at least 30 minutes in 3-30% lactobionic acid, and the disclosure of a sufficient amount is absorbed, it is clear, absent any

clear and convincing evidence to the contrary, that said sufficient amount would include 0.1-20%.

4. Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 11, 14, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Winterbottom et al. U.S Patent No. 2,930,702.

Winterbottom et al. discloses a method for producing a food product which comprises contacting meat with lactobionic acid (col. 1, line 15, col.2, line 10, & col. 3, line 1). Slaughtered poultry is submerged into an antibiotic solution, containing 3 to 30% by weight of lactobionic acid (col. 3, line 34) and allowed to freeze for at least 30 minutes, after which, the poultry is then packed and distributed to the market place (col.4, lines 6-15). The poultry will be cooked (col. 3, line 70), therefore becoming heated. Although Winterbottom does disclose that the flesh of the poultry absorbs sufficient antibiotic for adequate protection." (col. 4, line 10-13), the reference does not expressly disclose the amount of lactobionic acid absorbed. However, given that the poultry is soaked for at least 30 minutes in 3-30% lactobionic acid, and the disclosure of a sufficient amount is absorbed, it is clear, absent any clear and convincing evidence to the contrary, that said sufficient amount would include 0.1-20%.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

6. Claims 2, 8-10, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Winterbottom et al. CH Patent No. 356,659 or Winterbottom et al. U.S Patent No. 2,930,702 in view of Roselle et al. U. S. Pat. No. 6,773,737.

Winterbottom is applied as discussed above in paragraphs 3 and 4. Both references are silent to applying lactobionate acid to minced, fish, or emulsified meat and the product being surimi. Both are also silent to the form of lactobionate acid.

Roselle discloses a method for treating food products with a solution containing calcium lactobionate (col. 1, line 45 & col. 6, line 63). The food product can be in the form of beef, pork, chicken, and shellfish. Ground (minced) beef or turkey and fish cakes (of which surimi would be consider since it is defined as "ground meat") and fish cakes are also disclosed, as well as emulsified meat product, such as bologna, hot dogs, and sausages (col. 11, lines 3-10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a solution containing calcium lactobionate in minced meat or surimi, as disclosed by Roselle, in Winterbottom, given Roselle's teaching of the solution being effective in killing microorganisms in food (col. 10, lines 21-53).

7. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Winterbottom et al. CH Patent No. 356,659 or Winterbottom et al. U.S Patent No. 2,930,702 in view of Halden et al. EP 0 354 262.

Winterbottom discloses treating a food product with a lactobionic acid containing solution, resulting in a meat product containing lactobionic acid. The references are silent concerning marinating the meat by tumbling, however given that Halden teaches marinating

meat using tumbling procedures (pg. 2, line 26) along with it being a well known procedure in the art, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to use said procedure since it is known to allow for more penetration of the desired marinade (pg. 2, line 32).

8. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Winterbottom et al. CH Patent No. 356,659 or U.S Patent No. 2,930,702 in view of Hayashabira GB Patent No. 1 325 727.

Winterbottom et al. discloses treating a food product with a lactobionic acid containing solution, resulting in a meat product containing lactobionic acid. The references are silent concerning how the lactobionic acid is produced. Hayashabira discloses producing lactobionic acid from lactose by enzymatic oxidation (pg. 1, lines 71-85). Therefore, it would have been within the ambit of one of ordinary skill to manufacture said acid enzymatically given it is a known formation source in the art.

Response to Arguments

9. Claims 1-14 and 17-18 are currently pending. Claims 15-16 are cancelled.

10. Applicant's amendment filed April 6, 2010 is sufficient to overcome the 35 U.S.C 102(b) rejection of Roselle (US 6,773,737), set forth in the previous office action. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Winterbottom in view of Roselle (US 6,773,737). Please see above.

Applicant's argument to Winterbottom (CH 356,659 & US 2,930,702) and Roselle (US 6,773,737) not "teach[ing] or suggest[ing] a food product comprising 0.1-20% (weight/weight)

lactobionic acid or a method for producing the same” (page 5) is noted. Roselle is no longer applied as a primary reference and is now applied in combination with Winterbottom, therefore the argument concerning Roselle not disclosing the presently claimed amount of lactobionic acid is moot. Applicant’s argument regarding Winterbottom is not persuasive. Winterbottom discloses a method for producing a food product which comprises contacting meat with 3 to 30% by weight lactobionic acid for a time of 30 minutes to 4 hours and in this time a sufficient amount of antibiotic is absorbed (see ¶ 3 and ¶ 4 above). Given that Winterbottom discloses the same method, i.e. contacting meat product with a lactobionic acid solution, it is the examiner’s position, absent any clear and convincing evidence to the contrary, that said sufficient amount would include the presently claimed 0.1-20% (weight/weight). Regarding applicant’s statement to the references disclosure of further dilution resulting in “about 10ppm of citric acid”, however as stated in the reference, this amount and the dilution factor can vary (col. 3, lines 41-66) and it is the examiner’s position, absent any clear and convincing evidence to the contrary, that said food product will result in a sufficient amount of lactobionic acid present in the food product, including the presently claimed 0.1-20% (weight/weight).

Applicant’s argument regarding Halden (EP 0 354 262) and Hayashabira (GB 1 325 727) have been noted, and note that while Halden (EP 0 354 262) and Hayashabira (GB 1 325 727) do not disclose all the features of the present claimed invention, they are used as a teaching references, and therefore, it is not necessary for these secondary reference to contain all the features of the presently claimed invention, *In re Nievelt*, 482 F.2d 965, 179 USPQ 224, 226 (CCPA 1973), *In re Keller* 624 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871, 881 (CCPA 1981). Rather these

Art Unit: 1787

references teaches a certain concept, marinating meat using a tumbling procedure (Halden) and producing lactobionic acid from lactose by enzymatic oxidation (Hayashabira), and in combination with the primary reference, discloses the presently claimed invention.

Regarding the prior art made of record and not relied upon which is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure, as stated in the previous office action, both FR 556 064 and U.S. Patent No. 6,045,990 discloses a process wherein meat products are preserved by contacting them with lactobionic acid. They are cumulative to the rejection of records. U.S Patent Nos. 4,214,518 and 5,714,188 disclose the use of tumbling to marinate meat products.

Conclusion

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LELA S. WILLIAMS whose telephone number is (571)270-1126. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 7:30am-5pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Callie Shosho can be reached on 571-272-1123. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/LELA S. WILLIAMS/
Examiner, Art Unit 1787

/L. S. W. /

/Callie E. Shosho/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1787

